

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. In response filed March 15 2010, the Applicant amended claims 1 and 25. Claims 1-6, 13-18, 25-34, 45-54 are pending in the current application.
2. **NOTE:** In the interest of compact prosecution, the Examiner notes, Claim 25 shows the incorrect status identifier as the claim should be identified as (Currently Amended). Furthermore, the Applicant amended the preamble, however the amended part have not been properly underlined. Appropriate action is required.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, see page 15, filed March 15 2010, with respect to claims 1-6 and 25-34 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C §101 rejection of claims 1-6 and 25-34 has been withdrawn.
4. Applicant's arguments filed March 15 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
5. With respect to claims 1-6 and 13-18, the Applicant asserts that DeMarcken does not teach every limitation of claims 1-6 and 13-18 as amended. More specifically the Applicant asserts that the claimed invention provides for an input of a "geography range" which enable the user the ability to choose from either a known departure and destination points or choosing a general geographic area without knowing airport identification letters or cities where airports are located which may not be known to the

user, and thus DeMarcken does not teach or disclose "querying the user for a first set of input data, the input data being at least one departure airport or geography range and at least one arrival geography range associated with the travel departure and arrival" The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

DeMarcken discloses "The query entry window 360 is produced by activating either the ORIGIN or DESTINATION controls 352 in the window 350. The query window 360 includes a user entry area 361 for entering a destination code or origin code (as appropriate) such as a three letter airport code or a location such as a city, region or country (e.g., Turkey). Region 364 depicts a listing of airports in a region about the location entered in area 361." (col 59 lines 51-58) From DeMarcken's disclosure, it is explicitly stated that location such as a city, region or country can be entered for destination or origin, thereby teaching the claimed limitation of claim 1. Furthermore, taking the disclosure in combination with the associated Figure 21 it is clear DeMarcken teaches enabling the user the ability to choose from either a known departure and destination points or choosing a general geographic area without knowing airport identification letters or cities where airport are located which may not be known to the user, e.g. the user only has to searches for the general region of Turkey, and window 364 of Fig 21 shows a listing of airports in the region about Turkey without the user knowing the specific airport identification letters or cities where airports are located within the region about Turkey.

The Applicant also asserts that DeMarcken does not disclose or teach the limitation of "the computing device querying a travel database comprising travel data

including separately maintained travel schedule data items, fare data items, and fare limitation information for **matching itineraries** with all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections combinations;" (Emphasis added) the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 1 and 13 recite similar limitations, the claims queries the user for input data regarding the departure and arrival airport or region, searches based on the input information, displaying the departure and arrival airport or the list of departure and arrival airports, then queries the user for exact departure and arrival dates and times, a range of acceptable departure and arrival dates and times **or** a range of an acceptable length of stay (Emphasis added) and then querying a travel database for itineraries of all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections combinations that matches the data input by the user in the earlier method steps. DeMarcken teaches such limitation.

DeMarcken discloses receiving inputs from the user for exact departure and arrival dates and times, which is also the range of an acceptable length of stay (Fig 24) and window 370 display displaying matching itineraries with flights that includes a listing 372 of airports involved in the results (col 60: lines 52-54), DeMarcken further discloses that the display 370 shown in Fig 22 typically represents a small fraction of the total number of pricing solutions that may be represented by the pricing graph 38'. Other ones, if they exist, can be revealed by manipulation of a scroll bar 355. Furthermore, the display will permit a user to resort the data according to any one of a number of characteristics such as cost, duration, departure time, arrival time, number of legs, number of segments and so forth, and a similar arrangement is provided for the return

Art Unit: 3628

display. (col 62: lines 15-16, 20-21) Therefore it is clear that DeMarcken discloses displaying all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections combinations that matches itineraries that is inputted by the user.

With respect to claims 25 and 45 the Applicants assert that the subject application is further distinguished from DeMarcken by providing the user with an extensive list of possible itineraries with various ways of sorting the user's choices. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. DeMarcken discloses in Figs 22 and 24 an extensive list of possible itineraries for an user to view and that the display permits the user to resort the data according to any one of a number of charastics such as cost, duration, departure time, arrival time, number of legs, number of segments and so forth. (col 62: lines 13-16)

The Applicant also asserts that neither DeMarcken nor Walker address calculating and generating a set of all feasible combinations of the user's itinerary as in the subject application. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claim 25 and 45 recite querying a travel database... for matching itineraries with all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections combinations. In looking at Figs 22 and 24 and the associated text it is clear that all feasible combinations of flight travel that matches the user's itinerary is generated, DeMarcken discloses receiving inputs from the user for exact departure and arrival dates and times, for example, the user's itinerary is to fly from ESB to SAN on the shown dates, and window 370 display displaying matching itineraries with flights that includes a listing 372

of airports involved in the results (col 60: lines 52-54), windows 370 shows all possible combinations of itinerary that involves different flight dates and times, different airports, different airlines, different flight class, different number of connections combinations. DeMarcken further discloses that "as shown in FIG. 22, twenty-one possible solutions are represented in the horizontal bar graph ordered by increasing total fare. This typically represents a small fraction of the total number of pricing solutions that may be represented by the pricing graph 38". Other ones, if they exist, can be revealed by manipulation of a scroll bar 355." (col 61: lines 3-8)

With regards to claim 26, the Applicant asserts that "Daughtrey does not disclose calculated length of stay of each combination or a maximum number of combinations disclosed in the subject application." The Examiner respectfully disagrees. It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., calculated length of stay of each combination or a maximum number of combinations) are not recited in the rejected claim 26 or claim 25 to which 26 depends from. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As discussed above with respect to claim 25, DeMarcken combined with Walker teach calculating and generating a set of all feasible combinations that matches the user's itinerary.

With regards to claims 27-34 and 46-54, the Applicant asserts that Daughtrey does not provide the "all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connection combinations (claim 25, 45)" As discussed above with respect to claim 25, DeMarcken combined with Walker teach querying a travel database

for matching itineraries with all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections combinations. Therefore claims 27-34 and 46-54 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-6, 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat No 6,275,808 to DeMarcken.

Referring to Claim 1:

A method of searching travel products and providing a plurality of alternative travel itineraries to the user comprising:

Querying the user on a display screen of the computing device for a first set of input data, the input data being at least one departure airport or geography range and at least one arrival geography range associated with the travel departure and arrival. (Fig 21; col 59: lines 50-56)

The computing device searching an information storage and retrieval system for travel departure and arrival information corresponding to the first set of input data. (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

Displaying on the display screen of the computing device the information associated with the selected travel departure and arrival information, including a list of at least one departure airport selected or within the selected travel departure geography and a list of at least one arrival airport within the selected travel arrival geography; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

Querying the user on the display screen of the computing device for exact departure and arrival dates and times, a range of acceptable departure and arrival dates and times or a range of an acceptable length of stay; (Fig 21)

The computing device querying a travel database comprising travel data including separately maintained travel schedule data items, fare data items, and fare limitation information for matching itineraries with all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections; (col 59: lines 66-67; col 60: lines 31-67)

Displaying on the display screen of the computing device the information associated with the travel departure and arrival. (Fig 22-25)

Referring to Claim 2:

The method of claim 1, further comprising querying the user for a second set of input data, the second set of input data including selecting at least one acceptable departure airport and at least one acceptable arrival airport associated with the travel departure and arrival. (col 59: lines 53-61; Fig 21, field 364 shows the available airports for the Turkey region, and field 361 shows an acceptable airport being ESB)

Referring to Claim 3:

The method of claim 1, further comprising querying the user for an acceptable maximum number of connections. (Fig 22, Nonestop, Direct)

Referring to Claim 4:

The method of claim 1, further comprising querying the user for an acceptable means of sorting and displaying the results of the travel database query. (col 60: lines 34-51)

Referring to Claim 5:

The method of claim 1, further comprising accessing a remotely accessible source for making travel destination reservations. (Fig 1; col 3: lines 34-45; lines 61-66)

Referring to Claim 6:

The method of claim 1, further comprising making a reservation at a selected travel destination using the remotely accessed source for making travel destination reservations. (col 3: lines 34-45; lines 61-66)

Referring to Claim 13:

A system of searching travel products and providing a plurality of alternative travel itineraries to the user comprising:

Querying means for querying the user for input data, the input data being at least one departure airport or geography range and at least one arrival geography range associated with the travel departure and arrival; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 50-56)

Searching means for searching the information storage and retrieval system for travel departure and arrival information corresponding to the first set of input data; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

Displaying means for displaying the information associated with the selected travel departure and arrival information, including a list of at least one departure airport selected or within the selected travel departure geography and a list of at least one arrival airport within the selected travel arrival geography; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

Querying means for querying the user for exact departure and arrival dates and times, a range of acceptable departure and arrival dates and times or a range of an acceptable length of stay; (Fig 21)

Querying means for querying a travel database comprising travel data including separately maintained travel schedule data items, fare data items, and fare limitation information for matching itineraries with all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length or stay, and number of connections combinations; (col 59: lines 66-67; col 60: lines 31-67)

Displaying means for displaying the information associated with the travel departure and arrival. (Fig 22-25)

Referring to Claim 14:

The system of claim 13, further comprising querying means for querying the user for a second set of input data, the second set of input data including selecting at least one acceptable departure airport and at least one acceptable arrival airport associated with the travel departure and arrival. (col 59: lines 53-61; Fig 21, field 364 shows the available airports for the Turkey region, and field 361 shows an acceptable airport being ESB)

Referring to Claim 15:

The system of claim 13, further comprising querying means for querying the user for an acceptable maximum number of connections. (Fig 22, Nonestop, Direct)

Referring to Claim 16:

The system of claim 13 further comprising querying means for querying the user for an acceptable means of sorting and displaying the results of the travel database query. (col 60: lines 34-51)

Referring to Claim 17:

The system of claim 13, further comprising accessing means for accessing a remotely accessible source for making travel destination reservations. (Fig 1; col 3: lines 34-35; lines 61-66)

Referring to Claim 18:

The system of claim 13, further comprising reservation means for making a reservation at a selected travel destination using the remotely accessed source for making travel destination reservations. (col 3: lines 34-35; lines 61-66)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 25 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeMarcken in view of U.S. Pub No 2007/0208625 to Walker et al.

Referring to Claim 25:

A method, using a computing device executing a program stored on a computer readable storage media for searching travel products and providing a plurality of alternative travel itineraries to the user comprising:

DeMarcken discloses

Querying the user on a display screen of the computing device for a first set of input data, the input data being at least one departure airport or geography range and at least one arrival geography range associated with the travel departure and arrival; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 50-56)

The computing device searching an information storage and retrieval system for travel departure and arrival information corresponding to the first set of input data; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

Displaying on the display screen of the computing device the information associated with the selected travel departure and arrival information, including a list of at least one departure airport selected or within the selected travel departure geography and a list of at least one arrival airport within the selected travel arrival geography; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

DeMarcken disclose querying the user for acceptable departure and arrival dates and times (Fig 21). DeMarcken does not expressly disclose querying the user for a range of acceptable departure and arrival dates and times and a range of an acceptable length of stay;

Walker et al disclose descriptions can be received from a customer for a desired air travel itinerary, and the description may include one or more condition values corresponding to the conditions Departure City, Departure Date, Departure Time, Arrival City, Arrival Date, Arrival Time, Airline, Class, or the like, And the conditions values can be specified in terms of a range. [0174]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for DeMarcken to combine accepting range values for travel request as disclosed by Walker et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the querying and searching elements disclosed by DeMarcken and the travel range values element disclosed by Walker et al merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

DeMarcken disclose the computing device querying a travel database comprising travel data including separately maintained travel schedule data items, fare data items, and fare limitation information for matching itineraries with all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections combinations; (col 59: lines 66-67; col 60: lines 31-67) and

Displaying on the display screen of the computing device the information associated with the travel departure and arrival. (Fig 22-25)

Referring to Claim 45:

A system of searching travel products and providing a plurality of alternative travel itineraries to the user comprising:

DeMarcken discloses

Querying means for querying the user for a first set of input data, the input data being at least one departure airport or geography range and at least one arrival geography range associated with the travel departure and arrival; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 50-56)

Searching means for searching the information storage and retrieval system for travel departure and arrival information corresponding to the first set of input data; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

Displaying means for displaying the information associated with the selected travel departure and arrival information, including a list of at least one departure airport selected or within the selected travel departure geography and a list of at least one arrival airport within the selected travel arrival geography; (Fig 21; col 59: lines 57-59)

DeMarcken disclose querying the user for acceptable departure and arrival dates and times (Fig 21). DeMarcken does not expressly disclose querying the user for a range of acceptable departure and arrival dates and times and a range of an acceptable length of stay;

Walker et al disclose descriptions can be received from a customer for a desired air travel itinerary, and the description may include one or more condition values corresponding to the conditions Departure City, Departure Date, Departure Time, Arrival

Ciy, Arrival Date, Arrival Time, Airline, Class, or the like, And the conditions values can be specified in terms of a range. [0174]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for DeMarcken to combine accepting range values for travel request as disclosed by Walker et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the querying and searching elements disclosed by DeMarcken and the travel range values element disclosed by Walker et al merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

DeMarcken disclose querying means for querying a travel database comprising travel data including separately maintained travel schedule data items, fare data items, and fare limitation information for matching itineraries with all possible departure and arrival airport, date, time, length of stay, and number of connections combinations; (col 59: lines 66-67; col 60: lines 31-67) and

Displaying means for displaying the information associated with the travel departure and arrival. (Fig 22-25)

10. Claims 26-34, 46-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeMarcken in view of Walker et al in further view of U.S. Pat No 7,346,526 to Daughtrey et al.

Referring to Claim 26:

DeMarcken and Walker et al do not expressly disclose wherein a set of feasible combinations of departure dates and times and arrival dates and times is generated.

Daughtrey et al disclose a flexible travel query system using a range of departure, arrival dates and times wherein a set of feasible combinations of departure dates and times and arrival dates and times is generated. (col 5: lines 19-32; col 6: lines 16-30, Fig 4)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for DeMarcken and Walker et al to include the travel combination generation as disclosed by Daughtrey et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the travel query and generation of feasible combination of travel dates merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to Claim 27:

DeMarcken and Walker et al do not expressly disclose wherein a length of stay is calculated for each feasible combination.

Daughtrey et al disclose a flexible travel query system using a range of departure, arrival dates and times wherein a combination of travel arrangement is made according to user enter specification such as date and length of stay. (col 5: lines 19-32; col 6: lines 16-30, Fig 2 and 4)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for DeMarcken and Walker et al to include the travel

combination generation as disclosed by Daughtrey et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the travel query and generation of feasible combination of travel dates merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to Claims 28 and 29:

DeMarcken discloses eliminating pricing solutions when it does not correspond to user entered criteria. (col 60: lines 41-43)

DeMarcken does not expressly disclose eliminating feasible combinations where a length of stay is greater or less than the maximum and minimum acceptable length of stay designated by the user.

However, the difference between user entered criteria disclosed by DeMarcken and length of stay that is greater or less than the maximum and minimum acceptable length of stay are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The receiving and eliminating steps would be performed the same regardless of the descriptive material since none of the steps explicitly interact therewith. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to eliminate travel solutions when it does not match a user entered length of stay because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Referring to Claim 30:

DeMarcken discloses the method of claim 25, further comprising querying the user for a second set of input data, the second set of input data including selecting at least one acceptable departure airport and at least one acceptable arrival airport associated with the travel departure and arrival. (col 59: lines 53-61; Fig 21, field 364 shows the available airports for the Turkey region, and field 361 shows an acceptable airport being ESB)

Referring to Claim 31:

DeMarcken discloses the method of claim 25, further comprising querying the user for an acceptable maximum number of connections. (Fig 22, Nonstop, Direct)

Referring to Claim 32:

DeMarcken discloses the method of claim 25, further comprising querying the user for an acceptable means for sorting and displaying the results of the travel database query. (col 60: lines 34-51)

Referring to Claim 33:

DeMarcken discloses the method of claim 25, further comprising accessing a remotely accessible source for making travel destination reservations. (Fig 1; col 3: lines 34-45; col 61-66)

Referring to Claim 34:

DeMarcken discloses the method of claim 25, further comprising making a reservation at a selected travel destination using the remotely accessed source for making travel destination reservations. (col 3: lines 34-45; col 61-66)

Referring to Claim 46:

DeMarcken and Walker et al do not expressly disclose wherein a set of feasible combinations of departure dates and times and arrival dates and times is generated.

Daughtrey et al disclose a flexible travel query system using a range of departure, arrival dates and times wherein a set of feasible combinations of departure dates and times and arrival dates and times is generated. (col 5: lines 19-32; col 6: lines 16-30, Fig 4)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for DeMarcken and Walker et al to include the travel combination generation as disclosed by Daughtrey et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the travel query and generation of feasible combination of travel dates merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to Claim 47:

DeMarcken and Walker et al do not expressly disclose wherein a length of stay is calculated for each feasible combination.

Daughtrey et al disclose a flexible travel query system using a range of departure, arrival dates and times wherein a combination of travel arrangement is made according to user enter specification such as date and length of stay. (col 5: lines 19-32; col 6: lines 16-30, Fig 2 and 4)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for DeMarcken and Walker et al to include the travel combination generation as disclosed by Daughtrey et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the travel query and generation of feasible combination of travel dates merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to Claims 48 and 49:

DeMarcken discloses eliminating pricing solutions when it does not correspond to user entered criteria. (col 60: lines 41-43)

DeMarcken does not expressly disclose eliminating feasible combinations where a length of stay is greater or less than the maximum and minimum acceptable length of stay designated by the user.

However, the difference between user entered criteria disclosed by DeMarcken and length of stay that is greater or less than the maximum and minimum acceptable length of stay are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not

functionally involved in the steps recited. The receiving and eliminating steps would be performed the same regardless of the descriptive material since none of the steps explicitly interact therewith. Limitations that are not functionally interrelated with the useful acts, structure, or properties of the claimed invention carry little or no patentable weight. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Ngai*, 70 USPQ2d 1862 (CAFC 2004); *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

Therefore, it would also have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to eliminate travel solutions when it does not match a user entered length of stay because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Referring to Claim 50:

DeMarchen discloses the system of claim 45, further comprising querying means for querying the user for a second set of input data, the second set of input data including selecting at least one acceptable departure airport and at least one acceptable arrival airport associated with the travel departure and arrival. (col 59: lines 53-61; Fig 21, field 364 shows the available airports for the Turkey region, and field 361 shows an acceptable airport being ESB)

Referring to Claim 51:

DeMarcken discloses the system of claim 45, further comprising querying means for querying the user for an acceptable maximum number of connections. (Fig 22, Nonstop, Direct)

Referring to Claim 52:

DeMarcken discloses the system of claim 45, further comprising querying means for querying the user for an acceptable means for sorting and displaying the results of the travel database query. (col 60: lines 34-51)

Referring to Claim 53:

DeMarcken discloses the system of claim 45, further comprising accessing a remotely accessible source for making travel destination reservations. (Fig 1; col 3: lines 34-45; col 61-66)

Referring to Claim 54:

DeMarcken discloses the system of claim 45, further comprising making a reservation at a selected travel destination using the remotely accessed source for making travel destination reservations. (col 3: lines 34-45; col 61-66)

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ROB WU whose telephone number is (571)272-3136. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571)272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Rob Wu/

Application/Control Number: 10/826,928

Art Unit: 3628

Examiner, Art Unit 3628

Page 24